

RECEIVED

2011 AUG 20 PM 8:15

M.L. HATCHER, CLK
U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
W.D. OF WA AT SEATTLE

BY _____ DEP CLK.

FILED
LODGED

ENTERED
RECEIVED

AUG 22 2011 JS

AT SEATTLE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
BY WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
DEPUTY

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

BRENDA JOYCE LITTLE, an
attorney on leave, (No. 17688)

Plaintiff,

v.

THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,
and, WASHINGTON STATE BAR
ASSOCIATION, a state agency,
SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT
NO 1, AND CLOVER PARK
SCHOOL DISTRICT.

Defendants.

No. 11-cv-1387 JLR

CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT
FOR COMPENSATORY AND
PUNITIVE DAMAGES AND
JURY DEMAND



11-CV-01387-CMP

No Iss / LFF App

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

I. STATEMENT ON JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This is an action under 42 U. S. C. §1983, seeking compensatory and punitive damages for the deprivation, under color of state law, of rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, and the federal statutes §1983 and §1981.

2. The Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U. S. C. §§ 1331 and 1343 (a) (3).

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U. S. C. §1391 (b), because the defendant resides within this judicial district and all of the claims asserted by Brenda J. Little within this District.

II. STATEMENT OF CAUSES OF ACTION

4. Defendants combined, together, collectively, and in concert to take affirmative, concrete steps to use state agencies, the courts, and other organizations, to kill by cutting off the oxygen, life blood of the Law Office of Brenda and to illegally attempt to disgorge Little from the ranks of licensed attorneys by unlawfully and dishonestly taking her law license. In order to effectuate these two goals the major and minor co-

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 conspirators committed fraud, fraud in the inducement, intentional
2 misrepresentation, disparate treatment, unequal protection, ex parte
3 discussion with hearing officer, hostile work environment, illegal search
4 and seizure, invasion of privacy, bad faith, conversion, tortious
5 interference racially discriminatory treatment, injurious falsehood,
6 collusion, bribery, burglary, attempted assault, promotion of loss of
7 business opportunities, and improper use of state and federal courts
8 and state agencies to realize its it proscribed goals.
9
10
11

III. THE PARTIES

12
13 5. Plaintiff Brenda J. Little is black female, and citizen of the United
14 States who resides between Kent and Seattle, Washington. Little's
15 official address is PO Box 702, Kent, WA 98035-0702.
16
17

18 6. Defendant State of Washington c/o Attorney General address is
19 1325 Fourth Ave., Ste. 600 , Seattle, WA 98101-2539. Its telephone
20 number is 206-443 9722.
21

22 7. Defendant Washington State Bar Association status is unknown, it
23 does not appear to be incorporated as a private non-profit, it was
24 deemed a state agency until this status was rescinded in Senate Bill 5936
25
26

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 based upon the Supreme Court decision in WSBA v. State of
2 Washington, 125 Wn.2d 901 (1995) because it was considered an
3 encroachment upon the judicial powers of the Washington Court
4 judicial system. WSBA is not a properly constituted adjunct of the
5 Washington State Supreme Court. See Motion for Declaratory
6 Judgment.
7
8

9
10 8. Defendant Seattle School District No. 1 is organized as a municipal
11 corporation under the laws of the state. Its address is 2445 Third Ave. S.
12 Seattle, WA 98134, 206 252-0000.
13

14 9. Defendant Clover Park School District is organized as a municipal
15 corporation under state laws. Its address is 10903 Gravelly Lake Drive
16 SW, Lakewood, WA 98499, 253-583-5000.
17
18

19 **COUNT ONE**
20 **CIVIL CONSPIRACY**

21 10. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and
22 every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-8 above, as if set forth herein
23 in full.
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 11. The key difference civil conspiracies and civil conspiracies is that
2 in civil law, it is necessary for an overt act to be committed in
3 furtherance of the conspiracy Judge Learned Hand stated, "whatever
4 may be the rule in criminal conspiracies, it is well settled that civil
5 liability does not depend upon the confederation . . . , but upon the acts
6 committed in realization of the common."
7

8
9 12. To establish a civil conspiracy, a must prove by clear, cogent, and
10 convincing evidence that (1) two or more people combined to
11 accomplish an unlawful purpose or combined to accomplish a lawful
12 purpose by unlawful means; and (2) the conspirators entered into an
13 agreement to accomplish the conspiracy. All Star Gas, Inc. v. Bechard,
14 100 Wash. App. 732, 740, 998 P.2d 367 (2000).
15
16
17
18

19 13. Little asserts that the State of Washington entered in to a
20 conspiracy with its various components, the attorney general's office, the
21 superior courts, the bar association, the office of administrative hearings,
22 office of public instruction, OFM, Seattle School District, Clover Park
23 School District, Ellensburg School and two Federal Judges The
24 Honorable Thomas Zilly and the Honorable Ronald Jones to literally cut
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 off the "air supply" clients and fair court decisions to Little and her
2 clients while at the same time use every concert measure to deprive
3 Little of her law license under suspect circumstance including fixing a
4 psychological examination with Kenneth Muscatel, Ph.D. Little has filed
5 a complaint with the health department and an investigator has been
6 assigned to the case. The defendants' concerted and overt actions were
7 design to kill the Law Office of Brenda J. Little and deprive of the right
8 to practice law. The co-conspirators succeeded in killing the Law Office
9 of Brenda J. Little but could not overreach the evidence and its
10 investigation to take her private property.
11
12
13
14
15

16 **COUNT TWO**
17 **FRAUD**

18 14. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and
19 every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-13 above, as if set forth herein
20 in full.
21

22 15. The elements necessary to establish fraud – all of which must be
23 shown by clear, cogent, and convincing evidence – are a representation
24 of an existing fact; its materiality; its falsity; the speaker's knowledge of
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 its falsity; his intent that it shall be acted upon by the person to whom it
2 is made; ignorance of its falsity on the part of the person to whom it is
3 addressed; the later's reliance on the truth of the representation; his
4 right to rely upon it; and his consequent damage. See *Williams v. Joslin*,
5 65 Wn.2d 696, 399 P.2d 308 (1965); See *Michielli v. United States*
6 *Mortgage Co.*, 58 Wn.2d 221, 361 P.2d 758 (1961); *Chiles v. Kail*, 34
7 Wn.2d 600, 208 P.2d 1198 (1949).

11 16. The Washington State Bar Association (hereinafter "WSBA")
12 claims in its website that "The Washington Supreme Court has
13 exclusive responsibility in Washington State to administer the lawyer
14 discipline and disability system and to maintain appropriate standards
15 of professional conduct. The Supreme Court delegates authority for the
16 operation of that system to the Washington State Bar Association
17 through the Disciplinary Board, hearing officers, and the Office of
18 Disciplinary Counsel. Only the Supreme Court can suspend or disbar a
19 lawyer. All lawyers admitted to practice law in Washington are subject
20 to lawyer discipline." WSBA knows this statement to be false.
21 Especially, the Statement that "Only the Supreme Court can suspend or
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 disbar a lawyer." Unless the lawyer appeals to the Supreme Court
2 WSBA's suspension or disbarment judgment becomes conclusive,
3 irrefutable, and final.

4
5 17. WSBA knew or should have know that it lacked the constitutional
6 authority to operate as an Article III court, operating without a proper
7 adjunct designation from the legislature and it purposely refused to be
8 supervised by the Washington Supreme Court.
9
10

11 18. WSBA knew or should have known that six months earlier the
12 Washington State Supreme Court issued a ruling to them and others
13 that held that WSBA should give lawyers an opportunity to secure
14 counsel and lawyers should not be tried in absentia. *In The Matter of*
15 *Disciplinary Proceeding Against Sanai*, No. 200,578-1. Supreme Court
16 2009
17
18
19

20 19. WSBA knew or should have known that have attorney general
21 involvement violated the principals of separation of powers and violated
22 Articles I, II, & III. It knew by not informing lawyers on its website that
23 an assistant attorney general was assigned to it half time represented a
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 fraudulent misrepresentation of the true nature of the proceedings and
2 charging process. See Little Appendix A, Page No. 10.

3
4 20. WSBA knew or should have known that Little sued two states
5 agencies on the behalf of clients and by having attorney general
6 involvement at the two crucial stages, the charging process, Review
7 Committee, and the decision to disbar process, the Discipline
8 Committee created a constitutional conflict of interest, comprised
9
10 "judicial independence" and on information and belief hastened Little's
11 disbarment proceedings and the taking of her private property by the
12 government. See Little Appendix A, Page No. 10.
13
14

15
16 21. WSBA knew or should have know that if Little had been informed
17 of the attorney general involvement she would have filed a motion
18 similar to the instant motion for declaration judgment.
19

20 22. WSBA's Joanne Ableson knew that the decision was to disbar
21 Little from the onset but she went on to imply that the Disciplinary
22 Committee was consideration suspension therefore inducing Little to
23 withdraw her first petition for disability. See Note that Joanne Ableson
24 Insisted Little Write: supreme court and bar files.
25
26

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

23. WSBA committed fraud when it allowed an opposing counsel in the Runkel case to sit in on the discussions to disbar when it knew that disbarring Little would be a positive outcome for his client, the Lake Washington School District.

24. WSBA's Discipline Committee committed fraud when it allegedly read the transcript of the hearing and did not order a new hearing based upon the following strong-armed pressure placed on Hearing Officer Donald Allen by two members of the executive branch:

HEARING OFFICER "If I am to find that Ms. Little violated the RPCs, in my mind there's an issue of proportionality... why disbarment in this particular case vs. a suspension."

MR. BEITEL After thirteen lines discuss, Now in terms of proportionality, I think the question may be we have a single instance of conversion, but we have certainly cited Schemer, which was a case where there is a single instance of conversion."

HEARING OFFICER: Is there any concern about the factual statements made by Ms. Little in her pleadings and to the investigators with regard to truthfulness?

PAUL LUVERA In generalities, this is a woman who has practiced law for 21 years. She was five years with the

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 Attorney General's Office. Two of those years was,
2 she spent in the child protection section, and Then
3 14 years she was the staff counsel for I the school,
4 Seattle School System, representing a hundred
5 principals and a number of grade schools, and quit
6 after 14 years because she said they had passed her
7 over for promotion because of gender bias. A male
8 got appointed instead of her so she quit. She then
9 went into private practice, specializing in school
10 matters, employment matters, discrimination
11 matters. So lawyer, who is not inexperienced who
12 is It frightens me because we as a profession get to
13 police ourselves, and if we don't do a good job of
14 policing ourselves then we have failed both the
15 public and the profession and it will be taken away
16 from us. Whether disbarment is he right remedy,
17 I'm leaving that to the Bar Association to comment
18 on.

19 See (R 64-65)(WSBA's. Absentia Hearing Transcript.)

20 25. Beitel and Luvera knew that the grievant had been transferred
21 from one kitchen to another for theft of funds, lying about the theft of
22 funds, and calling her Asian supervisor racist names. Both Beitel and
23 Luvera spoke with Sharon Howard, Human Resources Director and she
24 reveal this grievant's background. Luvera and Beitel fraudulently
25 concealed this information from the hearing officer and then strong-
26 armed him into disbaring Little when the case they presented was

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 unimpeded by an defense. Luvera and Beitel never did answer the
2 hearing officer's question, which if he were truly independent should
3 have raised a red flag. See *Thomas, Administrator, United States*
4 *Environmental Protection Agency Union Carbide Agricultural Products*
5 *Co. et al*, 473 U.S. 568 (1985); *Northern Pipeline Construction Co. v.*
6 *Marathon Pipe Line Co.*, 458. U.S. (1982).
7
8

9
10 **COUNT THREE**
11 **BURGLARY**

12 26. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and
13 every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-125 above, as if set forth
14 herein in full.
15

16 27. A person is guilty of burglary in the second degree if, with intent
17 to commit a crime against a person or property therein, he enters or
18 remains unlawfully in a building other than a vehicle or a dwelling.
19
20

21 28. Twice in the same month did Little go out to her black Honda to
22 discover some had broken into her car. But this ordinary break in
23 whoever broke into her car took everything out of glove box and
24 console and stacked it into neat stacks onto the passenger seat. The
25
26

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 stacks were neat and orderly. Little jumped out of car, ran into her
2 house and got her husband. He said what she thought, this wasn't the
3 work of teenagers someone wanted to let you know that they had access
4 to your car.
5

6
7 29. Little was so afraid that she asked him to start her car. He started
8 the car standing with most of his body outside of the car. Obviously,
9 the car did not blow up. Little then asked him to check from tracking
10 devices. He said one could be anywhere so it would be useless to track.
11 Little's mind immediately came to Seattle School District. Its internal
12 investigator used to brag about how he was on a Special Forces team for
13 the FBI and did some CIA work. Eddie Hill struck me as someone who
14 would do this and would be smiling while doing it.
15
16
17
18

19 30. During this time period, Little had two real acrimonious cases, one
20 against the Seattle School District and one against the Seattle
21 Symphony. These defendants were "personally" affronted that Little
22 would sue them. Paula Lehman Davis Wright Tremaine said "oh you
23 won't last." Not did only did Little last for three years three against one
24
25
26 toe to toe Davis Wright had enlist the aide of WSBA.
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 31. Little went on with life and about three weeks later it occurred
2 again everything out of the glove box stacked neatly on the front seat.
3 Same routine Little had to go into the house to get her husband to start
4 the car. The most frightening thing about this was that Little had
5 recently moved into the Leschi neighborhood and took great pains to
6 conceal her home address specifically from WSBA. WSBA emitted the
7 type of energy alerted a person tuned into those things too be aware.
8
9
10

11 32. Little started to become concerned but not too concerned she did
12 not alter her law firm's focus. People who came to her pretty much said
13 the same thing; other lawyers would not take a case for fear of "being
14 crushed." Little now knows what they meant she had to live in her car
15 for 40 days, gone hungry asked to black men professional for help her
16 because she was hungry, Judge LeRoy McCullough had his whatever call
17 back to say, "Judge McCullough wants to know exactly what you want."
18 Little sent Ronald Ward former WSBA president first and only black
19 man on the governing an email. He never responded. Little was asking
20 for food.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

COUNT THREE
ATTEMPTED ASSAULT

33. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-32 above, as if set forth herein in full.

34. A person is guilty of assault in the [unknown] degree if he or she, under circumstances not amounting to assault in the first degree: (a) Intentionally assaults another and thereby recklessly inflicts substantial bodily harm; or (f) Knowingly inflicts bodily harm which by design causes such pain or agony as to be the equivalent of that produced by torture ...

35. Little believes that the Board has just voted to disbar her but she was going into the office daily to assist clients. Little rode the same bus home every night; it usually put her into Kent around 10:00 pm or shortly thereafter. One day Little got off the bus. She noticed a white pudgy man following her. She crossed in the middle to the street stopping traffic he did the same. Little kept looking back but he still kept following her. The faster Little walked the faster this man walked.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 Little said to herself that she was not going to down without a fight.
2 Little stopped threw down her belongings. She started walking briskly
3 toward this man yelling, "Bring It". He stopped looked at her. He looked
4 around. He appeared to be stunned. He then turned around and ran
5 back across the street.
6
7

8 36. A week or so later the same thing happened except different white
9 man. He had dark greasy hair, thin, with a moustache and mean eyes.
10 Little did the same thing she crossed the street twice and then started to
11 walk home. He kept following her. Little became enraged. She threw
12 her belongings down again. This time she walked faster toward this
13 man, yelling "Bring It", she had had enough. He stopped looked into
14 her eyes, stood there longer, and then he ran into a nearby alley. Little
15 picked up her belongings running home looking back the whole time.
16 She realized then the first time was not a random attacked. Little ran
17 home and literally did not leave out of it for nearly a year. She was
18 made sure she was never alone after those experiences.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

COUNT FOUR TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE

37. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-35 above, as if set forth herein in full.

38. Intentional and unjustified third-party interference with valid contractual relations or business expectancies constitutes a tort, with its taproot embedded in early decisions of the courts of England, e.g.: *Keeble v. Hickeringill*, 11 East 574, 11 Mod. 74, 130, 3 Salk 9, 103 Eng. Rep. 1127 (1809); *Lumley v. Gye*, 2 El. & Bl. 216, 118 Eng. Rep. 749 (1853); *Bowen v. Hall*, 6 Q.B.D. 333, 50 L.J.Q.B. 305 (1881); *Temperton v. Russell*, 1 Q.B. 715, 62 L.J.Q.B. 412 (1893); *South Wales Miners' Federation v. Glamorgan Coal Co.*, A.C. 239, 74 L.J.K.B. 525 (1905). See *Calbom v. Knudtzon*, 65 Wn.2d 157 (1964).

39. *Clover Park, Three Court of Appeals Division II Judges & WSBA, Judge Vicki Hogan and Judge Kathryn Nelson* : These public and private entity conspired to tortuously interfered with Little's contractual relation with Mack Litton. Mr. Litton retained Little to sue Clover Park School

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 District for racial discrimination and harassment. Little had Litton
2 collect letters from the assistant principle and other staff members at
3 Clover Park High School as well as a letter from his direct supervisor.
4 The totality of these letters proved that Mr. Litton was one the districts
5 best workers. Mr. Litton was transferred to an elementary school
6 because the school bully had continuously bullied his sons. Mr. Litton
7 had reported this harassment to school officials but the harassment did
8 not stop. Mr. Litton began picking up his sons from school. On the day
9 in question, Mr. Litton drove into the parking lot and saw his son
10 surround by these thugs. He ran up to the group and the leader made a
11 menacing toward Mr. Litton. Mr. Litton told them in a vernacular that
12 they understood and respected . Mr. Mr. Litton said that if they "did not
13 get the f---k away from him and his son they would regret it." This bully
14 was a big time athletic in a small time venue. He didn't even last a year
15 in at Eastern Washington University. His father demanded Mr. Litton
16 head. Mr. Litton was transferred to Clarkmore Elementary School. The
17 principal had Mr. Litton call her "Miss Molly." From day one, Miss
18 Molly started riding Mr. Litton.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 him. He sent the U.S. Marshalls to arrest Little but they couldn't in
2 good conscious do it.

3
4 53. The upshot. Judge Zilly has continued this matter four times and
5 the plaintiffs are in a worse spot than they were when Little managed
6 their case. Under no circumstances would Little want anything to do
7 with Chalice Stallworth, Jacque Johnson, Mark Della, or Audrey Weaver
8 but Little would like to be able to approach the remaining
9 unrepresented plaintiffs pick up the mantel. The last trial was
10 scheduled for October 2011 but he continued it. Why? His co-
11 conspirators Harvard Law School, J.D. cum laude Peter Maier and co-
12 conspirator Michael DeBell and co-conspirator by his silence Harium
13 Martin-Morris, the token black on the board are running for re-election
14 in November a publicized trial in October would dampen their already
15 dismissal chances of winning. These guys are no role models for
16 children.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 54. These three board members were on duty when an employee
24 stole 1.8 million dollars from the school district.
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 40. Miss Molly refused to allow Mr. Litton to travel to Louisiana to
2 help his father bury his wife, Mr. Litton step-mother whom he loved.
3 Miss Molly wrote him because he was a few minutes from visiting his
4 wife in the hospital. The doctor had to call human resources to let them
5 know how important Mr. Litton was to his wife's recovery.
6
7

8 41. One day Mr. Litton's Pilipino supervisor said to Mr. Litton, "Miss
9 Molly says you are just another worthless nigger." Mr. Litton
10 confronted Miss Molly. She started crying. In the day or so, Mr. Litton
11 reported to work. This big black man stood in his way in front of the
12 school. Parents and children were still in the courtyard. He told Mr.
13 Litton he was fired and told Mr. Litton to give him his keys and Miss
14 Molly's home number she had written on a card for Mr. Litton. Mr.
15 Litton looked up for a split second and Miss Molly was in the window
16 with other teachers pointing her finger laughing at Mr. Litton.
17
18
19
20
21

22 42. Clover Park School District played games from the beginning. The
23 parties were supposed to have a mediation conference except Clover
24 Park School District did not inform Mr. Litton it was being held at the
25 juvenile hall. Mr. Litton and Little walked all the Superior Court
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 building asking everyone where they would find the room number. No
2 one knew. Finally they stopped a judge, he did not know either but he
3 said who is the judge. Little said Judge Kathryn Nelson. The judge said
4 well she is on the juvenile rotation. "I don't know why she would be
5 handling a settlement conference."
6
7

8 43. They called but were told they were to late. This started a litany of
9 contempt orders by Judge Kathryn Nelson. She must have issued at
10 least four contempt orders to Little starting with not appearing at the
11 settlement conference. Clover Park School District moved for summary
12 judgment after the time period expired. Judge Vicki Hogan
13 manipulated the law. Clover Park School District got its summary
14 judgment. Little received a note for calendar that Judge Kathryn Nelson
15 had scheduled another show cause hearing for contempt. Little had a
16 restless night awoke early and headed to Tacoma Juvenile Hall. When
17 she arrived it was still dark. The judge's courtroom was dark as well.
18 Little realized she had been tricked. She calmly called Andrew Saller,
19 Clover Park School District's attorney of record. Mr. Saller's secretary
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 said you all have a motion for summary judgment in Judge Hogan's
2 courtroom.

3
4 44. Little sped over to superior court. Mr. Saller became noticeably
5 agitated. When Judge Hogan walked out of chambers she actually
6 walked back in part ways. She doesn't have a poker face. Little was last.
7 The first thing Ms. Little said is "why are we here." That statement did
8 not show up in transcript. Little did not have her files but Judge Hogan
9 said the parties were proceeding nonetheless. Reviewing the transcript,
10 Little did a pretty decent job she kept hammering at the fact that she
11 had 20 statements regarding Mr. Litton's superior performance and the
12 only evidence Clover Park School District had was a denial from Ms.
13 Molly and her assertion that Mr. Litton was a bad employee who
14 deserved termination for his poor job performance. Clover Park School
15 District was granted its motion for summary judgment. To Judge
16 Hogan's credit, she would not strike the 20 statements; she ruled they
17 were business records. She essentially punted to the Court of Appeals.
18 The Court of Appeals had a letter from Litton's supervisor saying that
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 he was the best worker and he left Litton in charge when he had
2 absences. The judges ignored this letter.

3
4 45. Little filed for an appeal. First the Court of Appeals sent her a
5 letter stating that the Court would not allow Mr. Litton his ten minutes
6 of oral arguments. Then it waited for 2 years to release a poorly written
7 four-page decision denying Mr. Litton's appeal. During this two-year
8 period, Little kept telling her client that if her gut instincts are correct
9 the Court would issue its opinion during the same week as her
10 impending disbarment. Little was wrong. The Court of Appeals issued
11 its opinion the same week Little was issued a show cause order for
12 summary suspension. Little never really believed that it would get this
13 far, no investigation, no counsel, no opportunity to be heard, tried in
14 absentia but yet and still the supreme court was going to suspend her
15 and not the attorneys from the bar.

16
17 46. While Little hurriedly threw something together so she could at
18 least preserve Mr. Litton's right to appeal; the appeal period expired.
19 Little sank deeper and deeper and deeper into her own private hell
20 during years, 2006-2010. Notable philosophers discussed the state of
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 nature where an individual exists only in a world of rights only. Little
2 was there. Little remembers receiving the notice from WSBA that it
3 was retaining Paul Luvera to prosecute her. Little read that letter and the
4 next thing she remembers was being two blocks from her office. Fight
5 or flight. As she walked back to her office, Little made a promise to
6 herself she would fight using any means necessary to defend herself
7 against the coercive power of the Washington State government.
8
9
10

11 47. Little promised Mr. Litton that he would get justice. Little is going
12 to continue fight until he gets his jury trial or a settlement commiserates
13 to his injury. There is no middle ground not until the United Supreme
14 Court says "no". Little no longer cares whether these people stay or go
15 her focus is on her promise to Mr. Litton. Little never again wants to
16 hear that she cannot ligate in a public courthouse.
17
18
19

20 48. Toward the end, Mr. Saller was pretty cocky. He kept telling Little
21 the bar said this and the bar said that. He was clearly working with
22 Beitel, he mentioned him by name. Little is going to request that Mr.
23 Litton gets his opportunity to be heard in front of a jury.
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 49. *Seattle Symphony, WSBA, and Judge Catherine Shaffer:* After a
2 three-year battle that took Little to federal court and back fighting for
3 the rights of a disabled violinist, Peter Kaman, Judge Shaffer, WSBA, and
4 Paula Lehman and a male attorney tortuously conspired to interfere
5 with her contractual relationship with Mr. Kaman. Mr. Kaman had
6 approximately 15 declarations from other orchestra members that did
7 not particularly like his idiosyncrasies.
8
9
10

11 50. Judge Shaffer granted the Symphony its motion for summary
12 judgment. She called the "declarations as little notes from your friends."
13 That was within Judge Shaffer's discretion to do so but it was at the end
14 of this long process that she disengaged from the process. Judge Shaffer
15 started issuing rulings without any underlying motions from the
16 Symphony. The Symphony disengaged from the process as well. Both
17 parties are mandated by court rule to complete the Joint Trial
18 Statement. Little could not get Paula Lehman to participate in
19 completing the Symphony's portion of the Joint Trial Statement. Little
20 completed her client's section and filed it as proof that the Symphony
21 knew the outcome of the second motion for summary judgment or
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 otherwise they would have completed their portion of joint trial
2 statement. That had been worked out with Judge Shaffer. She granted
3 the Symphony its second motion for summary judgment. Boy, the
4 Symphony would have been in dire straights with no witnesses or
5 evidence for trial.
6
7

8 51. Bruce Heller represented Symphony's players union for many
9 years. Mr. Heller worked with Little and promised he would be at
10 witness for Mr. Kaman. A month before trial Mr. Heller called and said
11 he had been appointed as a King County superior court judge. Judge
12 Heller would be unavailable as a witness. The state has many weapons.
13
14

15 52. *The State of Washington, Seattle School District, Honorable Judge*
16 *Zilly & Office of Administrative Hearings:* These entities tortuously
17 interfered with Little's contractual relationship. This is how it worked
18 in this particular instance. Little was working for Ellensburg School
19 District for a special education hearing. Administrative law judge
20 Mathew Wacker was told by Janice Shave to schedule as many
21 prehearing conferences with Little as possible. Shave told him to make
22 them long and he was always to give her some kind of written
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 assignment at the end. At the same time, Seattle School District had
2 scheduled depositions, and Judge Zilly was bearing down with show
3 cause orders. Triage. This Court has probably done its share of special
4 education appeals so it will be able to appreciate that fact that Wacker
5 scheduled 13 pre-hearing conference each lasting no less than 3 hours.
6
7 In a non-conspiratorial setting parties are lucky to get 2 pre-hearing
8 conferences. These conferences went on and on even when Little
9 politely told him that she had depositions scheduled. Presumably he
10 had deposition schedule. Little missed two or three depositions. Judge
11 Zilly pulled up the rear asked Little to take a time management course,
12 respond to this or that. Finally when they had Little where they wanted
13 her, Judge Zilly took her off the case leaving 9 plaintiffs ticked off. Little
14 tried to sever the most substantial cases off from the bulk. Judge Zilly
15 told them if they filed any more motions to dismiss he would dismiss
16 their cases with prejudice. Judge Zilly wrote a damning order published
17 it on the Internet. Little lost business as a result of this publication.
18
19 Little believes that Judge Zilly has racial animus against both blacks and
20 women in general put them together and a lawyer is in trouble with
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 55. Brian Sonntag literally changed the nature of the Washington
2 State Auditor's Office. Mr. Sonntag actually audits and expects for
3 public institutions to be responsible stewards of public funds. This is
4 what he said about the Seattle School District co-conspirators:
5

6 56. "Our audit found the School Board and executive management
7 must improve oversight of District operations. We noted several
8 instances in which public assets were misappropriated or susceptible to
9 misappropriation due to lack of effective policies, management's failure
10 to enforce existing policies and/or inadequately trained staff. The Board
11 and District management are not as familiar with state and federal law
12 on school district operations and on the use of grant funds as the public
13 would expect."
14

15 57. "The Board and District management are not as familiar with state
16 and federal law on school district operations and on the use of grant
17 funds as the public would expect. As a result, the District exposes itself
18 to greater risk of loss of federal funds and increases the risk for non-
19 compliance with laws and regulations."
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 58. "In all areas that we audited, we found the District did not comply
2 with state laws and regulations and its own policies and procedures.
3 These conditions were significant enough to report as findings" [in part]

4
5 59. "To date, the District has identified 83 employees who have been
6 overpaid. These individual overpayments range from \$175 to \$40,000
7 since the conversion to the new payroll system. Total overpayment 83
8 \$228,860, uncollected balance \$187,437 Also, the District believes
9 additional overpayments of at least \$105,080 were made to at least 61
10 other employees." See Washington State Auditor's Office Accountability
11 Audit Report Seattle School District No. 1 King County Report Date
12 June 21, 2010 Report No. 1003871 audit reports/auditreportfiles
13 <http://www.sao.wa.gov/ar1003871.pdf>
14
15
16
17
18

19 60. The cases that Judge Zilly removed Little from involved the rights
20 of black school employees. These were the most significant of the nine
21 cases: *Sandra Bosley v. Seattle School District*, Ms. Bosley has two
22 masters degrees, teaching French and Spanish, Language Arts. Seattle
23 School District has an agreement with University of Washington's,
24 Danforth Program for Administrators. At the time, Ms. Bosley
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 completed the program, Seattle School District had an agreement with
2 its teachers that anyone who completed the Danforth would be
3 guaranteed a position as assistant principal and/or principal. Ms. Bosley
4 completed the program with honors; she was the only black in her
5 cohort and the only district employee who did not get a principal's
6 position. Seattle School District comes up with a litany of reasons for
7 their denial. But two of the most respect administrators who happen to
8 be white wrote this about her.
9
10
11

12 61. "I am writing a letter of recommendation for Sandra Bosley. This
13 year Bosley worked in a leadership role as House Administrator at
14 McClure Middle School in Seattle Washington. Ms. Bosley also works
15 effectively with staff and parents. She listens well and asks for support
16 when needed. She demonstrates good judgment and effective time
17 management. She is well organized and demonstrates good follow up
18 in working with students. She keeps detailed records and provided
19 good communication with students and parents when dealing with
20 discipline issues. Ms. Bosley worked well with the Administrative
21 Team and used creative problem solving when working on issues
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 assigned to her. I support her in her leadership goal and would
2 recommend her highly. Please contact me if you need any further
3 information. Kathy Bledsoe, Principal.”
4

5 62. “It is with both pleasure and confidence that I recommend Sandra
6 Bosley for an Administrative position. I have known Sandra over eight
7 years and I have worked directly with her for two of this job. She
8 oversees our athletic program; our Arts Infusion program; and a host of
9 other program and activities that have contributed positively to McClure
10 Middle School. Sandra is very intelligent and extremely committed. If
11 given the opportunity I would hire Sandra as an assistant principal
12 based on her demonstrated abilities and her capability to maintain a
13 professional standard of conduct at all times. Sandra has demonstrated
14 her leadership skills throughout the time that I have known her. She
15 coordinates several programs including our athletic program through
16 which she has demonstrated superb organizational skills, and attention
17 to detail. have found Sandra to be a very unselfish person, her
18 commitment is to the building and the administrative team in order to
19 make our school the best possible place for students to grow and be
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 successful. She is and always has been open to feedback and learns
2 quickly. Sandra has shown the resourcefulness, energy and the
3 dedication necessary to become a true leader. Combining her
4 dedication, energy, and true enthusiasm for students, Sandra will be a
5 quality administrator in any building. In summary, I recommend her
6 without reservation as she seeks an administrative position and ask that
7 you give her application your most serious consideration. Sarah Pruitt.”
8
9
10

11 63. *Moody v. Seattle School District*, Mr. Moody was an instructional
12 assistant who almost had 20 years. Seattle School District did not to pay
13 him the money he earned by working his way up the grades so that
14 they constructed a story that he had an illicit affair with a high schooler,
15 called him a child abuser without cause or proof. The State of
16 Washington gave him unemployment benefits because they couldn't
17 believe the story either. Mr. Moody is barely surviving. He found other
18 employment but Seattle School District sent a letter saying he was a
19 child abuser they fired him.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 64. *Perkins v. Seattle School District*, Mr. Perkins was in custodial
2 services, he had nearly twenty years. Seattle School District fired him
3 because he had to have a hip replacement.
4

5 65. None of these individuals are represented after Judge Zilly
6 removed Little without notice to them and when they object he
7 threatened to dismiss their complaints with prejudice. He and his
8 Seattle School District co-conspirators succeed against removing Little
9 for these just cases, they just couldn't get her license, although they tried
10 hard but she fought back.
11
12
13

14 66. Little saw what was happening but was helpless nobody would
15 stick their necks out to help her. Chief Judge Lasnik was pretty sensitive
16 in his show cause request and his reprimand. No one ever asked why
17 Little appeared in his courtroom. He was not completely forthright but
18 he made a huge effort to hit the mark.
19
20
21

22 67. *WSBA, Mathew Wacker, Cynthia Minter, Seattle School District*
23 These individuals conspired to tortuously interfered with Little's
24 contractual relationship with two special education families. Both
25 families are furious with Little. Seattle School District and Larry
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 Ransom, Karr Tuttle came with a scheme to remove Little from two
2 special education cases which she had already put a lot of time in.

3
4 68. Ransom convinced these three administrator officers that they
5 could disqualify Little from these two special education cases. These
6 lawyers constructed a theory that Little could not handle these cases
7 because of lawyer-client privilege. Little presented three arguments to
8 Wacker, Shave, and Minter.
9
10

11 69. First Little argued that Seattle School District only cited to cases
12 involving state law. She argued that the cases arose under the *Individual*
13 *With Disabilities Education Act*, 20 U.S.C 1400 et. al, therefore the
14 administrative officers should use the federal standard for attorney-
15 client privilege. She provided Ninth Circuit law. [The Court was] "not
16 persuaded by this argument. All three cases cited by appellees in
17 support of it were decided under state law, and thus their holdings are
18 distinguishable from cases such as this one in which federal law must
19 be applied." *Weil v. Investment Indicators, Research & Management, Inc.*,
20 647 F. 2d 18 (1981). She explained under the Act parents and disable
21 children have a statutory right to choose the advocate of their choice
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 even if that advocate is the child's parent. See *Winkleman v. Parma City*
2 *School District*, ___ U.S. ___ (2007).
3

4 70. Next, Little argued a jurisdictional question that rose under the
5 United States Constitution, Article III §§ 1&2. She quoted extensively
6 from *Northern Pipeline Construction Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co.*, 458
7 U. S. 50 (1982) and *Crowell v. Benson*, 285 U. S. 22, 50 (1932). The Act
8 itself limits the jurisdiction of the administrative officer. "In general
9 Subject to clause (ii), a decision made by a hearing officer shall be made
10 on substantive grounds based on a determination of whether the child
11 received a free appropriate public education. See IDEA, 20 U.S. C. at
12 1415f(E)(i)."
13
14
15
16

17 71. Seattle School District used a general all-purpose clause in the
18 state administrative procedures act, which allows administrative officers
19 to hear motions. Little argued that the provision applied to state
20 administrative proceedings and IDEA administrative officers were
21 strictly limited to the subject matter in the federal statute, i.e. *Northern*
22 *Pipeline Construction Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co.*, 458 U. S. 50 (1982)
23 and *Crowell v. Benson*, 285 U. S. 22, 50 (1932).
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 72. Shave who refers to herself as the "Court" in special education
2 proceedings, Wacker who did not know a whole lot about special
3 education law, and Minter who unilaterally sent a order, which gave
4 Little three days to respond to it disqualified her after she raised the
5 subject of the government taking her private property.
6
7

8 73. The four parents are still angry at Little for making their child's
9 special needs hearing an unseemly three ring circus. Larry Ransom
10 noted in a letter to Cynthia Minter that Little did not sue after he pulled
11 this stunt the first time. Little is suing now.
12
13

14 74. While Little was researching an issue for another client she found
15 a case in which Larry Ransom, Karr Tuttle represent plaintiff, Glenda
16 Williams in the case in which he provided the Seattle School District
17 extensive advice. Larry Ransom is a white male and was definitely
18 conflicted out for his advice-giving role to the then superintendent.
19
20
21

22 75. Seattle School District and the Office of Administrative Hearings
23 tortuously interfered with Little's contract relationship with her clients
24 the Seattle School District by and through its agents, Steve Sundquist and
25 Peter Maier treated Little unequally on the basis of her race.
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 76. Little filed a bar complaint it was promptly denied in one day
2 without investigation.

3
4 77. *The Attorney General, WSBA, Seattle Central Community College*
5 *Administrative Officers, and Judge Mary Yui:* A sixteen year old white
6 head start student went into a parking garage to experiment with pot
7 for the first time. She never got to inhale hearing officers surprised
8 them and "arrested" them. The older more streetwise kids dumped the
9 pot in this sixteen years old book bag.
10
11

12
13 78. This sixteen-year-old honors 4.0 student was hysterical. She
14 begged them to allow her to call her mother. Campus security told after
15 she wrote a statement at one point telling her what to put into the
16 statement. There was a line with more text attached to it. This sixteen
17 year old was a volunteer in a nursing home, played sports, junior
18 symphony. She was squeaky clean until this one episode. Her mother
19 admitted that if she had wanted to experiment she had vast woods to
20 play in on Bainbridge Island. This student left her home every morning
21 at 4:00am to catch a ferry to attend Seattle Central because she wanted
22 to experience diversity all colors all types of individuals. Her mother's
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 Texas accent was thick. Little had a declaration from the former dean of
2 students. She said she had never in her lengthy tenure in that position
3 expelled anyone under these facts.
4

5 79.. Little also asked for this dean of students' discipline records.
6 Little's suspicions were correct. She expelled white students but not
7 black students. In fact, she portrayed herself as an unrepentant racist.
8 Little's major argument was this student would lose a \$50,000 free ride
9 scholar if she were to be expelled. Little begged this kid to get a white
10 attorney she slept on it but said no. The sixteen year lost she was
11 expelled and lost the \$50,000 scholarship.
12
13
14

15 80. Little appealed. None other than Judge Bruce Heller was assigned
16 to the case. It was more acrimonious than normal. How could baby
17 boomers be so judgmental? The majority of the hearing panel was
18 nearly all black many from the South. White employees walked softly
19 around these four black women. Little appreciates their wounds caused
20 by overt racism she understands even more so now but to beat up a
21 child no matter color what was indefensible to Little.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 81. Little went to work on Judge Heller he had a girl only slightly
2 younger. Eventually Judge Heller was gone. Good for him. In his place
3 was Judge Mary Yui. She was the designated dream buster. She did her
4 job coldly and efficiently. Her decision took \$50, 000 away from this
5 child trying to grapple with adult issues. Little challenges all of these
6 adults to swear under oath they never tried pot. In the hearing, Little
7 argued that President Obama had admitted to using much harder
8 drugs. And the Nation forgave him. Equity. The hearing officer objected
9 told Little to stop. Little left this ordeal with the concrete belief that
10 racism was repugnant no matter of who was wielding the sword of
11 discrimination.
12
13
14
15
16

17 82. This is the same attorney general's office that sat in Little's review
18 hearing and final decision meeting at WSBA to disbar her. The dots are
19 easy to connect.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

COUNT FIVE
UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICE

83. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-82 above, as if set forth herein in full

84. To prevail in a private action brought under the Consumer Protection Act, RCW 19.86.090, the plaintiff must establish that: (1) the defendant has engaged in an unfair or deceptive act or practice, (2) in trade or commerce, (3) that impacts the public interest, (4) the plaintiff has suffered injury in his or her business or property, and (5) a causal link exists between the unfair or deceptive act and the injury suffered. *Kallevig*, 114 Wash.2d at 920-21, 792 P.2d 520; *Hangman Ridge Training Stables, Inc. v. Safeco Title Ins. Co.*, 105 Wash.2d 778, 784-85, 719 P.2d 531 (1986).

85. Little relies upon on the facts delineated in Count Four.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

COUNT SIX
BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY AND CONTRACT

86. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-85 above, as if set forth herein in full.

87. WSBA created a fiduciary relationship therefore a fiduciary when it made membership in its organization mandatory. See RCW 2.48. et al. The Bar Act). It created a whole set of duties owed to it by Little. Ordinary contract law demands that there must be consideration in order for a contractual relationship to occur. If there is no consideration then the government stepped into the sphere of tyranny. Simply put, there must be some sort of consideration for the loss of Little's First Amendment Right of Freedom of Association. It is a fundamental right. Lawyers do not lose their constitutional rights at their swearing in ceremony. See *Goss v. Lopez*, 419 U.S. 565 (1975)(Those young people do not "shed their constitutional rights" at the schoolhouse door ...). "In the domain of these indispensable liberties, whether of speech, press, or

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 (association, the decisions of this Court recognize that abridgment of
2 such rights, even though unintended, may inevitably follow from varied
3 forms of governmental action," like mandatory membership in the bar.
4 See *NAACP v. Alabama ex rel. Patterson*, 357 US 449,460 (1958).
5

6
7 88. Here Washington State was not obligated to create a mandatory
8 bar association but once it made it "mandatory" it created a duty owed
9 to Little, a fiduciary duty. Attorneys may have a fiduciary duty to
10 nonplaintiff and in order to establish this fiduciary duty with Little.
11

12
13 89. Under a six-part test, the Court must look to "The extent to which
14 the transaction was intended to affect the plaintiff." See *Trask v. Butler*,
15 123 Wn.2d 835 (1994). WSBA knew or should have known that
16 impermissibly confiscating Little's law license would be a virtual death
17 sentence. Confiscating her license would leave her unable to pay
18 professional and personal debts, without any apparent means to
19 support herself, and the loss of future job prospects. The loss of self-
20 esteem and the support of a community she lived in for many years.
21 WSBA knew the emotional toil and stress she would have live under.
22 WSBA knew exactly what it was doing. See *Trask*, 123 Wn.2d at 840.
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 89. Second, "The foreseeability of harm to the plaintiff." See
2 paragraph 72.

3
4 90. Third, "The degree of certainty that the plaintiff suffered injury."
5 Living in a car for 40 days speaks to degree certainty that harm
6 occurred. Little lost everything including family keepsakes.
7

8 91. Fourth, "The closeness of the connection between the defendant's
9 conduct and the injury". Before the State's unwelcomed intrusion into
10 her life, Little was pretty much happy in spite of the bad choices she
11 made in spouses. See Cowan and Kinder, Smart Women, Foolish
12 Choices, New York, N.Y.: C.N. Potter : Distributed by Crown Publishers,
13 c1985.
14
15
16

17 92. Fifth, "The policy of preventing future harm." See Motion for
18 Declaratory Judgment.
19
20
21
22
23

24 ¹ Review by Connell Cowan: ... I know many very smart women. They seem to have it all together... But
25 wait!!!! Then you discover their flaw....When it comes to men, they make some really bad choices. We all make
26 stupid decisions when it comes to men at times, but these women repeat the same stupid choices over and
over again. My definition of insanity is making the same mistake over and over and expecting different
results. ..."

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 93. Sixth, "The extent to which the profession would be unduly
2 burdened by a finding of liability. Lawyers should also be required to
3 operate under the dictates of fairness and equal justice under the law."

4
5 94. Little believes at a minimum that the State owed her in
6 consideration a reasonable investigation of the false charges lodged
7 against her, fair treatment and respect, no discriminatory treatment, a
8 properly constituted adjunct tribunal, or an Article III court, a jury trial
9 or at least the opportunity to waive the right, dignity and decorum in
10 the processing of the false allegations, safeguards that do not allow the
11 executive branch to coerce the judicial officer into a particular decision,
12 a right to litigate in a public courthouse, a separate federal hearing
13 before her license is confiscated by the government, a minimum of
14 gossip and smear campaigns, fair treatment for her clients, respect for
15 the disabled, and a speedy resolution of the hearing process, a trial
16 schedule with specified dates, and above all the Washington State
17 Supreme Court's involvement. This is the consideration Little demands
18 for giving up her first amendment right of free association.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

COUNT SEVEN
FALSE REPRESENTATION, MISREPRESENTATION
AND INJURIOUS FALSEHOOD

95. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-95 above, as if set forth herein in full.

96. "False representation of a material fact, made for the purpose of inducing another to part with his property and with the intent to deprive him of his property, is inconsistent with any open and avowed claim of title preferred in good faith." Baertschi v. Jordan, 68 Wn.2d 478 (1966).

97. Misrepresentation is when "One who, in the course of his business, profession or employment ... supplies false information for the guidance of others in their business transactions, is subject to liability for pecuniary loss caused to them by their justifiable reliance upon the information, if he fails to exercise reasonable care or competence in

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 obtaining or communicating the information. *Havens v. C & D Plastics,*
2 *Inc., et al*, 124 Wn.2d 158 (1994)

3
4 98. Injurious falsehood is subject to liability is restricted to a) the
5 pecuniary loss that results directly and immediately from the effect of
6 the conduct of third persons, including impairment of vendibility or
7 value caused by disparagement, and (b) the expense of measures
8 reasonably necessary to counteract the publication, including litigation
9 to remove the doubt cast upon vendibility or value by disparagement.
10
11 *Dunning v. Paccarelli*, 63 Wn. App. 232 (1991).
12

13
14 99. Little relies on the facts and circumstances in every paragraph of
15 this complaint for damages. And adds that the State published false
16 allegations on its website, her suspension, and her disbarment when it
17 knew that the grievant's reputation for truth and veracity had been
18 questioned by other government agencies.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

**COUNT EIGHT
CONVERSION**

100. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-99 above, as if set forth herein in full.

101. A conversion is the act of willfully interfering with any chattel, without lawful justification, whereby any person entitled thereto is deprived of the possession. *Judkins v. Sadler-MacNeil*, 61 Wn.2d 1 (1962).

102. The State took Little's law license without lawful justification and the jurisdictional prerequisites and without due process.

**COUNT NINE
FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHT
AGAINST SEARCH AND SEIZURE**

103. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-86 above, as if set forth herein in full

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 104. The Bar Association violated Little's Fourth Amendment right, Art
2 I Section right prohibition and common law right against warrantless
3 searches without probable cause. The Bar Association opened up an
4 investigation in its own name without presenting probable cause to do
5 so. It searched Little's records at will for 3 years. *State v. Johnson*, 128
6 Wash.2d 431(1996). See also, *State v. Boland*, 115 Wn.2d 571 (1990). See
7
8
9 also Const. art I § 7.
10

11
12 **COUNT TEN**
13 **VIOLATION OF PRIVACY**
14 **WASH CONST. ART, I § 7.**
15

16 105. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and
17 every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-104 above, as if set forth
18 herein in full.
19

20 106. The State of Washington violated Little's right of privacy by
21 forcing her to produce records unrelated to the original complaint
22 without a warrant or probable cause. The Bar Association also violated
23 Little's right to privacy when it faxed the copy of the Complaint to
24
25
26

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 anyone who inquired about her. Three lawyers called and offered their
2 sympathies. A colleague called the Bar to asked what happened to Little
3 when he was unable to reach her. Randy Beitel asked him for his
4 address and a few days later he received the complaint but not Little's
5 answer. See *State v. Boland*, 115 Wn.2d 571 (1990). See Wash Const. art
6 I § 7.
7

8
9
10 108. Beitel also called her clients expressed to that Little was
11 incompetent and invaded her privacy by asking personal information.
12 Brandeis became a Supreme Court justice, and later wrote a famous
13 dissenting opinion that placed privacy at the very heart of the
14 Constitution. Beitel invaded every aspect of Little's private life including
15 fostering a relationship with her ex-husband to gather personal
16 information about her.
17
18
19

20 109. "The makers of our Constitution...sought to protect Americans in
21 their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations," he
22 stated in *Olmstead v. United States* (1928). "They conferred as against
23 the Government, the right to be let alone – the most comprehensive of
24 the rights of man and the right most valued by civilized men."
25
26
27

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

COUNT ELEVEN
VIOLATION OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

110. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-92 above, as if set forth herein in full.

111. The State of Washington tried Little in absentia because it refused to grant her a continuance. It failed to give her a meaningful opportunity to be heard. If fail to provide a fair, neutral, unbiased hearing officer. Instead of an article III court, Little received a hearing officer whose website boasted that his area of specialty was personal injury cases only, he did nothing else.

COUNT TWELVE
HOSTILE WORKING ENVIRONMENT

112. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-111 above, as if set forth herein in full.

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 113. The State of Washington created a hostile working environment
2 by sending her certified letters that she had to sign daily. The hostile
3 working environment in her business that was severe and pervasive that
4 it alter the terms and conditions of Little's business environment.
5

6
7 114. The State sent certified letters to her mother's home even though
8 Little did not live there to harass her mother and demonstrate to Little
9 that she was powerless to stop their attacks.
10

11 **COUNT THIRTEEN**
12 **FAILURE TO ACCOMMODATE**
13

14 115. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and
15 every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-114 above, as if set forth
16 herein in full.
17

18 116. The State of Washington failed to recognize a disability it helped
19 create. As her son, Harrison Murchison, said weekly "they cut off your
20 air supply, mom." Little has a claim for failure to reasonably
21 accommodate her. Little sent a claim to the Office of Financial
22 management saying Randy Beitel's constant harassment was driving her
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 at times to be suicidal and at times have homicidal impulses. The State
2 failed to act to stop the harassment.

3
4 **COUNT FOURTEEN**
5 **DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION**

6 117. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and
7 every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-116 above, as if set forth
8 herein in full.

9
10 118. Little has an equal protection claim. The Bar Association has only
11 white triers of fact. ABA wrote: The State has a rule for appointing
12 hearing officers "Considering whom to appoint as a Hearing Officer, the
13 Board of Governors should consider diversity in gender, ethnicity,
14 geography and practice experience. Rule 2.10 provides that the power to
15 appoint these individuals includes the power to remove them and to fill
16 any resulting vacancies."

17
18 119. Rules 2.3 and 2.5 provide for the appointment of Disciplinary
19 Board members, Hearing Officers and the Chief Hearing Officer by the
20 Board of Governors. The Board of Governors designates one lawyer
21 member to serve as Chair of the Disciplinary Board and another to serve
22
23
24
25
26

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 *In Re Wood*, 140 U.S. 278 (1891); *Gibson v. Mississippi*, 162 U.S. 565
2 (1896); *Bush v. Kentucky*, 107 U.S. 110 (1883); *Rogers v. Alabama*, 192
3 U.S. 226 (1904); *Martin v. Texas*, 200 U.S. 316 (1906); *Norris v.*
4 *Alabama*, 294 U.S. 587 (1935); *Hollins v. Oklahoma*, 295 U.S. 394
5 (1935); *Hale v. Kentucky*, 303 U.S. 613 (1938); *Pierre v. Louisiana*, 306
6 U.S. 354 (1939); *Smith v. Texas*, 311 U.S. 128 (1940); *Hill v. Texas*, 316
7 U.S. 400 (1942); *Akins v. Texas*, 325 U.S. 398 (1945); *Patton v.*
8 *Mississippi*, 332 U.S. 463 (1947); *Brunson v. North Carolina*, 333 U.S.
9 851 (1948); *Cassell v. Texas*, 339 U.S. 282 (1950); *Ross v. Texas*, 341
10 U.S. 91 (1951); *Brown v. Allen*, 344 U.S. 443 (1953); *Avery v. Georgia*,
11 345 U.S. 559 (1953); *Hernandez v. Texas*, 347 U.S. 475, (1954); *Reece v.*
12 *Georgia*, 350 U.S. 85 (1955); *Eubanks v. Louisiana*, 356 U.S. 584, 78 S.Ct.
13 970 (1958); *Coleman v. Alabama*, 84 S.Ct. 1152 (1964).

20 **COUNT FOURTEEN**
21 **42 U.S.C. SECTION 1981 CONTRACT CLAIM**

22
23 121. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and
24 every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-120 above, as if set forth
25 herein in full.
26

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 122. All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have
2 the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce
3 contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal
4 benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and
5 property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to the like
6 punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind,
7 and to no other.
8
9
10

11 123. Little alleges that WSBA has a pattern and history of racial
12 discrimination against blacks including not allowing them to be part of
13 the bar when it was originally formulated. The WSBA also has a history
14 of preventing blacks the right to "to make and enforce contracts." It was
15 in their capacity as state agents acting under the color of law the it
16 interfered with Little's rights to make and enforce contracts."
17
18
19

20 124. Little alleges that Seattle School District has a pattern and history
21 of racial discrimination against blacks including having separate and
22 unequal educational opportunities. Seattle School District also has a
23 history of denial blacks the right to "to make and enforce contracts." It
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 was in their capacity as state agents acting under the color of law that it
2 interfered with Little's rights to make and enforce contracts."

3
4 124. Little alleges that Clover Park School District has a pattern and
5 history of racial discrimination against blacks including having separate
6 and unequal educational opportunities. Clover Park School District also
7 has a history of preventing blacks the right to "to make and enforce
8 contracts." It was in their capacity as state agents acting under the color
9 of law that it interfered with Little's rights to make and enforce
10 contracts."
11
12
13

14
15 **COUNT FOURTEEN**
16 **42 U.S.C. SECTION 1983 CLAIM FOR DUE PROCESS**
17 **VIOLATIONS**
18 **LIBERTY INTEREST VIOLATION, A FIRST**
19 **AMENDMENT VIOLATION,**
20 **A FOURTH AMENDMENT VIOLATION AND A**
21 **SEVENTH AMENDMENT VIOLATION, MALICIOUS**
22 **PROSECUTION**

23 125. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and
24 every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-124 above, as if set forth
25 herein in full.
26

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 126. Little alleges that the State denied her right to a jury trial under
2 the Seventh Amendment.

3
4 127. As a result of their concerted unlawful and malicious conspiracy
5 Little was deprived of both her liberty without due process of law and
6 her right to equal protection of the laws, and the due course of justice
7 was impeded, in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of
8 the Constitution of the United States and 42 U.S.C. sec. 1983 and 1985.
9 Little alleges that the State impermissible seized and searched her law
10 firm's records without probable cause and without a warrant signed by
11 a neutral and detached magistrate.
12
13
14

15
16 128. As a result of their concerted unlawful and malicious conspiracy
17 Little was deprived of both her liberty interest in her reputation without
18 due process of law and her right to equal protection of the laws, and the
19 due course of justice was impeded, in violation of the Fifth and
20 Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution of the United States and
21 42 U.S.C. sec. 1983 and 1985. Little alleges defamation with stigma plus.
22
23

24 129. Acting under color of law and pursuant to official policy or
25 custom, the supreme court in its knowingly and recklessly in its
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 administrative capacity failed to to instruct, supervise, control, and
2 discipline WSBA on a continuing basis.

3
4 130. The State instituted malicious prosecution criminal process
5 against the plaintiff with malice. The State and the two municipal
6 corporations maliciously used a legal process to accomplish some
7 ulterior purpose for which it was not designed or intended, or which
8 was not the legitimate purpose of the particular process employees.
9
10

11
12 **COUNT FIFTEEN**
13 **INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF**
14 **EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

15 131. Plaintiff herein incorporates by reference and reallege each and
16 every allegation set forth in paragraphs 1-130 above, as if set forth
17 herein in full.
18

19
20 132. The State and the municipal corporations intentionally and
21 deliberately inflicted emotional distress on Little maliciously
22 prosecuting or assisting in prosecuting Little, or by abusing the lawful
23 process for unlawful purpose and by violating Little's constitutional
24 rights, and by conspiring against Little and or by interfering with Little's
25
26

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 state and federal civil rights by threats, coercion, or intimidation, or
2 knew or should have known that emotional distress was the likely
3 result of their conduct.
4

5 6 REQUEST FOR RELIEF

7
8 WHEREAS, Plaintiff requests for judgment against and each of
9 them as follows:
10

- 11 1. For general damages in a sum which will be shown
12 according to proof;
- 13 2. For medical expenses and other incidental expenses
14 according to proof;
- 15 3. For costs of suit incurred.
- 16 4. For declaratory and injunctive relief;
- 17 5. For punitive damages;
- 18 6. For such further relief as the Court deems just and proper.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

THE HONORABLE JUDGE GARR KING

1 Respectfully submitted on this 19th day of September, 2011.

2
3
4
5 
6 Brenda J. Little, Pro Se
7 brendalaw@me.com
8 206 329-5779
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28